



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,916

03/11/2004

Scott J. Broussard

AUS920030818US1

7011

45502 7590 09/15/2008

DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.,  
SUITE 2110  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

BROPHY, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2191

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/798,916	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BROUSSARD, SCOTT J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MATTHEW J. BROPHY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to RCE filed July, 30, 2008.

#### *Response to Amendment*

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being anticipated by US PG Publication 2004/0078540 Cirne et al. hereinafter Cirne. In view of US Patent 7,089,460 Fu hereinafter Fu and further in US Patent 6,658,652 Alexander et al hereinafter Alexander.
3. The text of these rejections not found in this office action can be found in the previous office action.

Regarding Claims 1, 11 and 21 Cirne teaches: A method [system, or article of manufacture] for detecting memory leaks in a software program, said method comprising the steps of: monitoring a specified one or more analysis properties of software objects executing in the software program **(Cirne Paragraph “[0015] The present invention, roughly described, pertains to technology for identifying potential sources of memory leaks by tracking growth patterns of groups of stored items. One example of a group of stored items is an instance of a Java**

Art Unit: 2191

**collection. If the growth pattern of a collection indicates that it may be the source of a memory leak, that collection is reported to a user and will continue to be tracked.”), and identifying any software objects determined to have one or more analysis properties that exceeds that property's predetermined limit. (Paragraph [0060]**

**In step 322, it is determined whether the change counter is greater than the sensitivity counter. The sensitivity counter is a static number that corresponds to the sensitivity setting described above. For example, Table 2 shows that if the sensitivity setting is 10 then the sensitivity counter is 3, and if the sensitivity setting is 4 then the sensitivity counter is 7. Thus, the first time the first threshold is exceeded (e.g. where the threshold becomes 5.4), the change counter will equal 1, which is less than the sensitivity counter (step 332). Therefore, the collection is reported as not leaking in step 334. If the change counter is greater than the sensitivity counter, then the collection is reported as being a potential source of a leak in step 336. For example, if the sensitivity setting is 9, then the sensitivity setting will be 3. When the change counter is greater than 3, the collection will be reported as a potential source of a leak. In other words, when the size of the collection grows so that more than three thresholds have been exceeded, the collection is reported as being a potential source of a leak.”).** Cirne does not explicitly teach: wherein the one or more specified analysis properties includes one of an object's age; determining if any analysis property of software objects being referenced following a garbage collection process exceeds a respective predetermined limit for such analysis property, wherein a predetermined limit for an object's age is an

Art Unit: 2191

object age limit However, these limitations are taught by Fu: wherein the one or more specified analysis properties includes one of an object's age. **(Column 5, Lines 59-66, “FIG. 3 illustrates an exemplary cutoff weighting subroutine 300 that simply discards old memory usage elements. Memory usage weighting subroutine 300 begins at block 301 and proceeds to looping block 305 where an iteration through each usage data element begins. The first step in the loop is decision block 310 where a determination is made whether the current usage data element is older than a threshold time.”)** determining if any analysis property of software objects being referenced following a garbage collection process exceeds a respective predetermined limit for such analysis property, wherein a predetermined limit for an object's age is an object age limit**(Column 5, Lines 59-66, “FIG. 3 illustrates an exemplary cutoff weighting subroutine 300 that simply discards old memory usage elements. Memory usage weighting subroutine 300 begins at block 301 and proceeds to looping block 305 where an iteration through each usage data element begins. The first step in the loop is decision block 310 where a determination is made whether the current usage data element is older than a threshold time.”)**. In addition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cirne with the object age comparison of Fu as: Cirne teaches the detection of memory leaks based on suspicious characteristics of object groups, wherein one of the characteristics is allocation time (see Cirne e.g. Paragraph [0052]). Also, Cirne teaches the comparison of another characteristic to a threshold (group size, referenced below). Finally, one of ordinary skill in the art would be

Art Unit: 2191

motivated to combine the memory leak detection of Cirne with the object age threshold of Fu as the an object age above the threshold could be another indicator of a potential memory leak in the system of Cirne.

Cirne does not teach: generating a statistics report including the generated stack walkback for the at least one identified software object~ wherein the statistics report is generated before the occurrence of an out-of-memory error and in a format that indicates a location of an executing logic at a time of the out-of-memory error~ and wherein the generated statistics report identifies the likelihood location of at least one memory leak in the software program.

generating a stack walkback for the at least one identified software object;

However, Alexander teaches:

generating a stack walkback for the at least one identified software object; **(Alexander Col. 17, Ln 38-53, “For example, at node 1152 in FIG. 11B, the call stack is CAB, and the statistics kept for this node are 2:3:4:1. Note that call stack CAB is first produced at time 2 in FIG. 10A, and is exited at time 3. Call stack CAB is produced again at time 4, and is exited at time 7. Thus, the first statistic indicates that this particular call stack, CAB, is produced twice in the trace. The second statistic indicates that call stack CAB exists for three units of time (at time 2, time 4, and time 6). The third statistic indicates the cumulative amount of time spent in call stack CAB and those call stacks invoked from call stack CAB (i.e., those call stacks having CAB as a prefix, in this case CABB). The cumulative time in the**

**example shown in FIG. 11B is four units of time. Finally, the recursion depth of call stack CAB is one, as none of the three routines present in the call stack have been recursively entered.”) and**  
**generating a statistics report including the generated stack walkback for the at least one identified software object~ wherein the statistics report is generated before the occurrence of an out-of-memory error and in a format that indicates a location of an executing logic at a time of the out-of-memory error and wherein the generated statistics report identifies the like of location of at least one memory leak in the software program.** (Alexander III Col 18, Ln 12-34“Tracing may also be used to track memory allocation and deallocation. Every time a routine creates an object, a trace record could be generated. The tree structure of the present invention would then be used to efficiently store and retrieve information regarding memory allocation. Each node would represent the number of method calls, the amount of memory allocated within a method, the amount of memory allocated by methods called by the method, and the number of methods above this instance (i.e., the measure of recursion). Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the tree structure of the present invention may be used to represent a variety of performance data in a manner which is very compact, and allows a wide variety of performance queries to be performed.”)

In addition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cirne with the metrics of Alexander as Alexander allows the developer to analyze the statistics and trace record to debug a memory leak.

4. Claims 10, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as being anticipated by US PG Publication 2004/0078540 Cirne et al. hereinafter Cirne. In view of US Patent 7,089,460 Fu hereinafter Fu and further in view of US Patent 6,658,652 Alexander et al hereinafter Alexander and further in view of US Patent 6,189,141 Benitez.

Regarding Claims 10, 20 and 30, Cirne teaches:

In addition Cirne further teaches: monitoring an amount of available memory for a software program referencing software objects **(Paragraph [0035] “A metric is a measurement of a specific application activity. Probes can be used to enable the reporting of a set of metrics for a managed application. Examples of metrics collected can include CORBA method timers, remote method indication method timers, thread counters, network bandwidth, JDBC update inquiry timers, servlet timers, Java Server Pages (JSP) timers, system logs, file system input and output bandwidth meters, availability and used memory, enterprise Java bean times, etc.”)**; and upon such determination, storing a current stack walkback of currently referenced software objects prior to the amount of available memory for a software program referencing software objects dropping below an amount of available memory necessary to store a current stack walkback **(Paragraph [0049] “If leak detection is enabled and the time out period has not expired (step 206), then the code in the constructor for the collection object will create a stack trace for the collection object in step 208. In step 210, the code in the constructor for the collection**



Art Unit: 2191

**object will pass a reference to the collection object and the stack trace to Agent 8.” While the determination is not taught by Cirne as explained below, the storing of the current stack trace is inherently prior to reaching the threshold as Cirne allocates memory for the trace).**

Cirne does not explicitly teach: determining when the amount of available memory for the software program referencing software objects is within a predetermined threshold amount of memory within zero memory available for the software program utilizing software objects; upon such determination determining that the amount of available memory for the software program referencing the software objects is within the predetermined threshold amount of memory from zero memory available for the software program utilizing the software storing a current stack walkback of currently referenced software objects prior to the amount of available memory for [[a]] the software program referencing software objects dropping below an amount of available memory necessary to store [[a]] the current stack walkback.

However, Benitez teaches: determining when the amount of available memory for the software program referencing software objects is within a predetermined threshold amount of memory within zero memory available for the software program utilizing software objects **(Benitez Col 38 Ln 66-Col 39, Ln5 “It is now assumed for illustrative purposes that storage locator 1210 has set the overflow flag. If the amount of memory made available by the elimination of cold traces, as described above, has been sufficient to reduce the amount of memory used in hot trace storage area 203 below the overflow threshold, cold trace detector and remover**

Art Unit: 2191

**1220 need not further identify cold traces for removal.”)** upon ~~such determination~~ determining that the amount of available memory for the software program referencing the software objects is within the predetermined threshold amount of memory from zero memory available for the software program utilizing the software storing a current stack walkback of currently referenced software objects prior to the amount of available memory for [[a]] the software program referencing software objects dropping below an amount of available memory necessary to store [[a]] the current stack walkback.

**(Benitez Col 38 Ln 66-Col 39, Ln5 “It is now assumed for illustrative purposes that storage locator 1210 has set the overflow flag. If the amount of memory made available by the elimination of cold traces, as described above, has been sufficient to reduce the amount of memory used in hot trace storage area 203 below the overflow threshold, cold trace detector and remover 1220 need not further identify cold traces for removal.”).**

In addition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Benitez as Benitez use of thresholds allow the system to avoid memory overflows.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. BROPHY whose telephone number is 571-270-1642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJB  
9/11/2008

/Wei Y Zhen/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191